



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,991	03/18/2004	Sang-Duk Lee	ABS-1480 US	8932
32605 7590 01/11/2008 MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP 2033 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 400 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			EXAMINER NGUYEN, DUNG T	
			ART UNIT 2871	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,991	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Dung Nguyen	Art Unit 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-8 and 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-8 and 10-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment dated 10/12/2007 has been received and entered. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-18 are now pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6, 10-11, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA), figure 3, in view of Park et al., US Patent 6,587,355.

Regarding the above claims, APA, figure 3, discloses a liquid crystal display (LCD) apparatus comprising:

- . an LCD panel (300);
- . a driver printed circuit board (PCB 310);
- . a backlight assembly (320);
- . a received container (part between backlight 320 and PCB 310);
- . a digitizer (330) inserted in a space that shown in figure 3.

APA, figure 3, however, does not disclose first and second protrusion forming on a back side of the received container. Park et al. does disclose a first protrusion (part between frame 82 and PCB 4) can be protruded from a received container (frame structure 82) (see figure 4A) to form an insertion part (e.g., space between PCB 4 and frame 82) and support the driver PCB. It

Art Unit: 2871

should also be noted that a second protrusion is not shown in figure 4a; however, such second protrusion would inherently formed from the opposing side in order to support the driver PCB (4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the APA's container having protrusions with receiving parts as shown by Park et al. for supporting the driver PCB.

It should also be noted that the limitation of "being configured to facilitate insertion" recites that an element is performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense and has not been given patentable weight in the device claim(s).

3. Claims 2-4, 7-8, 12-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA), figure 3, in view of Park et al., US Patent 6,587,355, further in view of Won, US Patent 6,046,785.

Regarding the above claims, the modification to APA disclose the claimed invention as described above except for first and second connection portions forming on a back side of the received container as well as the driver PCB including third and fourth connection portions corresponding to the first and second connection portions. Won does disclose protrusions can be formed form a mold frame structure (19)(see figure 1 and 2A) and forming connection portions corresponding to PCB connection portion (30) and connected together through a screw/screw hole (through hole over PCB 30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the APA's container having protrusions for forming connection portions to support the driver PCB through the PCD connection portions as shown by Won in order to stably ground the PCB.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/12/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments are as follow:

- a. APA of Applicant's figure 3 show the space is a filled space rather than an insertion space.
- b. since there is no protrusion in figure 3, the space is not predefined such that the digitizer 330 can simply be slid therein. In addition, in order to assemble the device of figure 3, a worker must lift up the data PCB to insert the digitizer. In deed, neither APA nor Parker appears to teach away from the use of the claimed insertion space.
- c. there is simply no teaching in Park and none of the cited references regarding the formation of an insertion space that "facilitate the insertion of the digitizer"

The examiner's responses are as follow:

- a. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's viewpoint. In particular, in this case, "the filled spacer" would be the same as "the insertion spacer as well" where the digitizer 330 can be placed in such spacer. In addition, as asserted by Applicant, the digitizer can be inserted in the spacer when assembling an LCD module ("to *insert* the digitizer when assembling an LCD module", see Applicant's argument page 9, line 2). In other words, APA's figure 3 does disclose a digitizer (330) and an insertion space (where the digitizer inserted) as well.
- b. it should be noted that the combination of APA and Park, as stated above, would result protrusions as well. In addition, since the claimed invention drawn to the device claim rather the method claim (e.g., assemble the device), the method of forming a device is not germane to die issue of patentability of the device itself.

Art Unit: 2871

c. regarding the formation of an insertion space that “facilitate the insertion of the digitizer”, as stated above, such limitation does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense and has not been given patentable weight in the device claim(s).

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-18 stand.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Art Unit: 2871

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 571-272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DN
01/07/2008

/Dung Nguyen/
Dung Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2871